arXiv:1501.05944v2 [math.OA] 1 Jun 2015

MARTINGALE INEQUALITIES IN NONCOMMUTATIVE SYMMETRIC SPACES

NARCISSE RANDRIANANTOANINA AND LIAN WU

Abstract. We provide generalizations of Burkholder's inequalities involving conditioned square functions of martingales to the general context of martingales in noncommutative symmetric spaces. More precisely, we prove that Burkholder's inequalities are valid for any martingale in noncommutative space constructed from a symmetric space defined on the interval $(0,\infty)$ with Fatou property and whose Boyd indices are strictly between 1 and 2. This answers positively a question raised by Jiao and may be viewed as a conditioned version of similar inequalities for square functions of noncommutative martingales. Using duality, we also recover the previously known case where the Boyd indices are finite and are strictly larger than 2.

1. Introduction

In classical martingale theory, a fundamental result due to Burkholder ([8, 9, 20]) can be described as follows: given a probability space (Ω,Σ,P), let $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ be an increasing sequence of σ-fields of Σ such that $\Sigma=\bigvee\Sigma_n$. If $2\leq p<\infty$ and $f=(f_n)_{n\geq1}$ is a L_p-bounded martingale adapted to the filtration $\{\Sigma_n\}_{n\geq1}$, then (using the convention that $\Sigma_0=\Sigma_1$),

$$\sup_{n\geq 1}[\mathbb{E}|f_n|^p]^{1/p} \simeq_p \Big[\mathbb{E}\big(\sum_{n\geq 1}\mathbb{E}[|df_n|^2|\Sigma_{n-1}]\big)^{p/2}\Big]^{1/p} + \Big[\sum_{n\geq1}\mathbb{E}|df_n|^p\Big]^{1/p}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\simeq_p$ means equivalence of norms up to constants depending only on p. The random variable $s(f)=\big(\sum_{n\geq1}\mathbb{E}[|df_n|^2|\Sigma_{n-1}]\big)^{1/2}$ is called the conditioned square function of the martingale f and the equivalence (1.1) is generally referred to as Burkholder's inequalities. The equivalence (1.1) was established by Burkholder as the martingale difference sequence generalizations of Rosenthal's inequalities [44] which state that if $2\leq p<\infty$ and $(g_n)_{n\geq1}$ is a sequence of independent mean-zero random variables in $L_p(\Omega,\Sigma,P)$ then

$$\Big(\mathbb{E}\big|\sum_{n\geq1}g_n\big|^p\Big)^{1/p} \simeq_p \Big(\sum_{n\geq1}\mathbb{E}|g_n|^2\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\sum_{n\geq1}\mathbb{E}|g_n|^p\Big)^{1/p}. \tag{1.2}$$

Probabilistic inequalities involving independent random variables and martingales inequalities play important roles in many different areas of mathematics. Burkholder/Rosenthal inequalities in particular have many applications in probability theory and structures of symmetric spaces in Banach space theory. On the other hand, a recent trend in the general study of martingale inequalities is to find analogues of classical inequalities in the context of noncommutative L_p-spaces. We refer to [39, 26, 28, 41] for additional information on noncommutative martingale inequalities. Noncommutative analogues of (1.1) and (1.2) were extensively studied by Junge

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 46L53, 46L52. Secondary: 47L05, 60G42.

Key words and phrases. Noncommutative martingales, martingale inequalities, noncommutative symmetric spaces, Boyd indices, interpolations.

Wu was partially supported by NSFC(No.11471337) and China Scholarship Council.

and Xu in [29, 30]. They obtained that if $2 \leq p < \infty$ and $x = (x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a noncommutative martingale that is L_p-bounded then

$$\|x\|_p \simeq_p \max\Big\{\|s_c(x)\|_p, \|s_r(x)\|_p, \big(\sum_{n\geq 1}\|dx_n\|_p^p\big)^{1/p}\Big\} \tag{1.3}$$

where $s_c(x)$ and $s_r(x)$ denote the column version and the row version of conditioned square functions which we refer to the next section for formal definitions. Moreover, they also treated the corresponding inequalities for the range $1 < p < 2$ which are dual versions of (1.3) and read as follows: if $x = (x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a noncommutative martingale in $L_2(\mathcal{M})$ then

$$\|x\|_p \simeq_p \inf\Big\{\|s_c(y)\|_p + \|s_r(z)\|_p + \big(\sum_{n\geq 1}\|dw_n\|_p^p\big)^{1/p}\Big\} \tag{1.4}$$

where the infimum is taken over all $x = y + z + w$ with y, z, and w are martingales. The differences between the two cases $1 < p < 2$ and $2 \leq p < \infty$ are now well-understood in the field. In [21], inequalities (1.3) and (1.4) were extended to the case of noncommutative Lorentz spaces $L_{p,q}(\mathcal{M})$ for $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q < \infty$. Motivated by this extension, it is natural to ask if some versions of noncommutative Burkholder's inequalities remain valid in the general context of noncommutative symmetric spaces. This question was explicitly raised in [22, Problem 3.5]. Martingale inequalities in the general framework of rearrangement invariant spaces have long been of interests. For the case of classical martingales, we refer reader to the work of Johnson and Schechtman [24, 25] and the references therein. For the noncommutative settings, we recall that generalizations of Burkholder-Gundy inequalities in noncommutative symmetric spaces were recently established in [14, 22], extensions of Junge's noncommutative Doob maximal inequalities in some symmetric spaces were treated in [13]. In a closely related topic, Le Merdy and Sukochev studied Rademacher averages on noncommutative symmetric spaces ([33]). These Rademacher averages turn out to provide one of the key ingredients in the solution of Burkholder-Gundy inequalities in noncommutative symmetric spaces in [14, 22]. Naturally, the concept of Boyd indices of symmetric spaces ([34]) and various interpolation techniques play significant roles in all the results stated above.

The present paper solves the problem discussed above. Our main result can be summarized as follows: assume that E is a rearrangement invariant function space on $(0,\infty)$ that satisfies some natural conditions and has nontrivial Boyd indices $1 < p_E \leq q_E < \infty$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is a semifinite von Neumann algebra equipped with a faithful normal semifinite trace τ. We obtain generalizations of (1.3) and (1.4) that read:

If $1 < p_E \leq q_E < 2$, then

$$\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \simeq_E \inf\Big\{\|s_c(y)\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} + \|s_r(z)\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} + \|(dw_n)_{n\geq 1}\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)}\Big\} \tag{1.5}$$

where as in (1.4), the infimum is taken over all decompositions $x = y + z + w$ with y, z, and w are martingales in $E(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$.

If $2 < p_E \leq q_E < \infty$, then

$$\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \simeq_E \max\Big\{\|s_c(x)\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}, \|s_r(x)\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}, \|(dx_n)_{n\geq 1}\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)}\Big\}. \tag{1.6}$$

We note that (1.6) was recently established by Dirksen in [12]. His approach follows closely the original arguments used in [29] taking advantage of the fact mentioned earlier that the noncommutative Burkholder-Gundy inequalities for square functions are valid for noncommutative martingales in some general symmetric spaces. Thus, our main motivation is primarily to establish the equivalence (1.5).

Our approach is based on another discovery made in the next section that, in some sense, one inequality in the equivalence (1.4) can be achieved with a decomposition that works simultaneously for all $1 < p < 2$. We refer to Theorem 2.10 below for more information. This simultaneous decomposition allows us to efficiently apply results from interpolation theory. Namely, we use concrete realization of noncommutative symmetric spaces as interpolations of noncommutative L_p-spaces by means of K-functionals and J-functionals. The non-trivial inequality in the equivalence (1.6) will be deduced from (1.5) using duality. Unlike the L_p-cases, this duality technique does not seem to apply for the other direction. That is, at the time of this writing, we lack necessary ingredients to deduce (1.5) from (1.6).

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we provide some preliminary results concerning noncommutative symmetric spaces, interpolation theory, and martingale inequalities. In particular, we establish a decomposition result for noncommutative martingales that sets up the use of interpolations. Section 3 is devoted entirely to the statement and proof of our main result. In the last section, we discuss some related results, provide examples, and point to related open questions concerning Burkholder's inequalities.

Our notation and terminology are standard as may be found in the books [6, 34, 45].

2. Definitions and preliminary results

2.1. **Noncommutative spaces.** In this subsection, we review some basic facts on rearrangement invariant spaces and their noncommutative counterparts that are relevant for our presentation.

For a semifinite von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$ equipped with a faithful normal semifinite trace τ, let $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ denote the topological $*$-algebra of all measurable operators with respect to $(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ in the sense of [36]. For $x \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$, define its generalized singular number by

$$\mu_t(x) = \inf\{\lambda > 0; \tau(e^{|x|}(\lambda, \infty)) \leq t\}, \quad t > 0$$

where $e^{|x|}$ is the spectral measure of $|x|$. The function $t \mapsto \mu_t(x)$ from $(0, \infty)$ into $[0, \infty)$ is right-continuous and nonincreasing ([19]). For the case where $\mathcal{M}$ is the abelian von Neumann algebra $L_\infty(0, \infty)$ with the trace given by integration with respect to the Lebesgue measure, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ becomes the linear space of all measurable functions $L_0(0, \infty)$ and $\mu(f)$ is the decreasing rearrangement of the function $|f|$ in the sense of [34].

We recall that a Banach function space $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$ on $(0, \infty)$ is called *symmetric* if for any $g \in E$ and any measurable function f with $\mu(f) \leq \mu(g)$, we have $f \in E$ and $\|f\|_E \leq \|g\|_E$. The Köthe dual of a symmetric space E is the function space defined by setting:

$$E^\times = \Big\{ f \in L_0(0, \infty) : \int_0^\infty |f(t)g(t)| \, dt < \infty, \forall g \in E \Big\}.$$

When equipped with the norm $\|f\|_{E^\times} := \sup\{\int_0^\infty |f(t)g(t)| \, dt : \|g\|_E \leq 1\}$, $E^\times$ is a symmetric Banach function space.

The symmetric Banach function space E is said to have the *Fatou property* if, whenever $0 \leq f_\alpha \uparrow_\alpha \subseteq E$ is an upwards directed net with $\sup_\alpha \|f_\alpha\|_E < \infty$, it follows that $f = \sup_\alpha f_\alpha$ exists in E and $\|f\|_E = \sup_\alpha \|f_\alpha\|_E$. It is well-known that E has the Fatou property if and only if the natural embedding of E into its Köthe bidual $E^{\times\times}$ is a surjective isometry. Examples of symmetric spaces with the Fatou property are separable symmetric spaces and duals of separable symmetric spaces.

Another concept that is central to the paper is the notion of Boyd indices which we now introduce. Let E be a symmetric Banach space on $(0, \infty)$. For $s > 0$, the dilation operator

$D_s : E \to E$ is defined by setting

$$D_s f(t) = f(t/s), \qquad t > 0, \qquad f \in E.$$

The *lower and upper Boyd indices* of E are defined by

$$p_E := \lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{\log s}{\log \|D_{1/s}\|} \text{ and } q_E := \lim_{s\to 0^+} \frac{\log s}{\log \|D_{1/s}\|},$$

respectively. It is well-known that $1 \leq p_E \leq q_E \leq \infty$ and if $E = L_p$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ then $p_E = q_E = p$. We shall say that E has non-trivial Boyd indices whenever $1 < p_E \leq q_E < \infty$. We refer to [6, 34] for any unexplained terminology from function space theory.

For a given symmetric Banach function space $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$ on the interval $(0,\infty)$, we define the corresponding noncommutative space by setting:

$$E(\mathcal{M},\tau) = \big\{x \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \ : \ \mu(x) \in E\big\}.$$

Equipped with the norm $\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M},\tau)} := \|\mu(x)\|_E$, the space $E(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ is a complex Banach space ([32]) and is referred to as the *noncommutative symmetric space* associated with $(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ corresponding to the function space $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$. We remark that if $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $E = L_p(0,\infty)$ then $E(\mathcal{M},\tau) = L_p(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ is the usual noncommutative L_p-space associated with $(\mathcal{M},\tau)$.

Recall that a linear operator $T : X \to Y$ is called a *semi-embedding* if T is one to one and $T(B_X)$ is a closed subset of Y where $B_X = \{x \in X : \|x\| \leq 1\}$. As in the commutative case, if $1 \leq p < p_E \leq q_E < q \leq \infty$ then the space $E(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ is intermediate to the spaces $L_p(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ and $L_q(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ in the sense that

$$L_p(\mathcal{M},\tau) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M},\tau) \subseteq E(\mathcal{M},\tau) \subseteq L_p(\mathcal{M},\tau) + L_q(\mathcal{M},\tau)$$

with the inclusion maps being continuous. Moreover, if E satisfies the Fatou property, one can readily verify that the second inclusion map $E(\mathcal{M},\tau) \hookrightarrow L_p(\mathcal{M},\tau) + L_q(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ is a semi-embedding. These facts will be used in the sequel.

We end this subsection with the following elementary lemma. It will be used in the proof of our main result. We include a proof for completeness.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that* $1 < p < q < 2$ *and let* $u \in L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})$. *There exists a sequence* $(u_m)_{m\geq 1}$ *in* $L_1(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_2(\mathcal{M})$ *with* $\lim_{m\to\infty} \|u_m - u\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M})\cap L_q(\mathcal{M})} = 0$ *and both sequences* $(\|u_m\|_p)_{m\geq 1}$ *and* $(\|u_m\|_q)_{m\geq 1}$ *are increasing and converge to* $\|u\|_p$ *and* $\|u\|_q$, *respectively.*

Proof. Let $e^{|u|}$ denote the spectral measure of $|u|$. For each $m \geq 1$, set $e_m := e^{|u|}([1/m, m])$. Then $(e_m)_m$ is an increasing sequence of projections in $\mathcal{M}$ that converges to $\mathbf{1}$ for the strong operator topology. Clearly, for every $m \geq 1$, $\tau(e_m) \leq m^p \|u\|_p^p < \infty$. Set $u_m := ue_m$. It is easy to check that $u_m \in L_1(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathcal{M}$. A fortiori, $u_m \in L_1(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_2(\mathcal{M})$. From the identities

$$\begin{aligned}\max\big\{\|u - u_m\|_p, \|u - u_m\|_q\big\} &= \max\big\{\|u(\mathbf{1} - e_m)\|_p, \|u(\mathbf{1} - e_m)\|_q\big\} \\ &= \max\big\{\|(\mathbf{1} - e_m)|u|^2(\mathbf{1} - e_m)\|_{p/2}^{1/2}, \|(\mathbf{1} - e_m)|u|^2(\mathbf{1} - e_m)\|_{q/2}^{1/2}\big\},\end{aligned}$$

we get that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|u - u_m\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M})\cap L_q(\mathcal{M})} = 0$. On the other hand, if s is equal to either p or q, it follows from the identity $\|u_m\|_s = \||u|e_m|u|\|_{s/2}^{1/2}$ that $(\|u_m\|_s)_m$ forms an increasing sequence that converges to $\|u\|_s$. □

We refer to [10, 16, 40, 46] for extensive discussions on various properties of noncommutative symmetric spaces.

2.2. **Function spaces and interpolations.** In this subsection, we will discuss concrete description of certain classes of noncommutative symmetric spaces as interpolations of noncommutative L_p-spaces that are relevant for our method of proof in the next section. We begin by recalling that for a given compatible Banach couple (X_0, X_1), a Banach space Z is called an *interpolation space* if $X_0 \cap X_1 \subseteq Z \subseteq X_0 + X_1$ and whenever a bounded linear operator $T : X_0 + X_1 \to X_0 + X_1$ is such that $T(X_0) \subseteq X_0$ and $T(X_1) \subseteq X_1$ we have $T(Z) \subseteq Z$ and $\|T : Z \to Z\| \leq C \max\{\|T : X_0 \to X_0\|, \|T : X_1 \to X_1\|\}$ for some constant C. In this case, we write $Z \in \mathrm{Int}(X_0, X_1)$. When $C = 1$, Z is called exact interpolation space. We refer to [6, 7, 31] for more on interpolations.

In this paper we rely heavily on the notions of K-functionals and J-functionals which we now review:

For a compatible Banach couple (X_0, X_1), we define the J-functional by setting for any $x \in X_0 \cap X_1$ and $t > 0$,

$$J(x, t; X_0, X_1) = \max\big\{\|x\|_{X_0}, t\|x\|_{X_1}\big\}.$$

As a dual notion, the K-functional is defined by setting for any $x \in E_0 + E_1$ and $t > 0$,

$$K(x, t; X_0, X_1) = \inf\big\{\|x_1\|_{X_0} + t\|x_2\|_{X_1}; x = x_1 + x_2\big\}.$$

If the compatible couple (X_0, X_1) is clear from the context, then we will simply write $J(x, t)$ and $K(x, t)$ in place of $J(x, t; X_0, X_1)$ and $K(x, t; X_0, X_1)$, respectively. It is now quite well-known that any symmetric Banach function space with the Fatou property that belongs to $\mathrm{Int}(L_p, L_q)$ is given by a K-method. More precisely, we have the following result due to Brudnyi and Krugliak (see for instance [31, Theorem 6.3]).

Theorem 2.2. *Let E be a symmetric Banach function space on $(0, \infty)$ with the Fatou property. If $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_p(0, \infty), L_q(0, \infty))$ for $1 \leq p < q \leq \infty$, then there exists a function space F on $(0, \infty)$ such that $f \in E$ if and only if $K(f, \cdot, L_p, L_q) \in F$ and there exists a constant C such that*

$$C^{-1}\big\|K(f, \cdot)\big\|_F \leq \|f\|_E \leq C\big\|K(f, \cdot)\big\|_F.$$

We will use the corresponding J-method of the above theorem. This was studied in [4, 5]. We review the basic construction of this method and introduce a discrete version that is quite essential in the next section.

Suppose that an element $x \in X_0 + X_1$ admits a representation

$$x = \int_0^\infty u(t)\ dt/t, \tag{2.1}$$

where $u(\cdot)$ is measurable function that takes its values in $X_0 \cap X_1$ and the integral is convergent in $X_0 + X_1$. For any given representation $u(\cdot)$, we set for $s > 0$,

$$j(u, s) = \int_s^\infty t^{-1} J(u(t), t)\ dt/t. \tag{2.2}$$

Given a symmetric Banach function space F defined on $(0, \infty)$, the interpolation space $(X_0, X_1)_{F,j}$ consists of elements $x \in X_0 + X_1$ which admit a representation as in (2.1) and are such that

$$\big\|x\big\|_{F,j} = \inf\Big\{\big\|j(u, \cdot)\big\|_F\Big\} < \infty, \tag{2.3}$$

where the infimum is taken over all representation u of x as in (2.1). We refer to [4, 5] for a comprehensive study of this interpolation method along with some other equivalent methods. As noted above, we will need a discrete version of this method. This is standard but we could not find any reference in the literature for this particular method so we provide the details.

We define the interpolation space $(X_0, X_1)_{F,\underline{j}}$ to be the space of elements $x \in X_0 + X_1$ which admit a representation

$$x = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}} u_\nu \quad \text{(convergence in } X_0 + X_1) \tag{2.4}$$

with $u_\nu \in X_0 \cap X_1$ and are such that

$$\big\|x\big\|_{F,\underline{j}} = \inf\Big\{\Big\|\underline{j}(\{u_\nu\}_\nu, \cdot)\Big\|_F\Big\} < \infty,$$

where the decreasing function $\underline{j}(\{u_\nu\}_\nu, \cdot)$ is defined by

$$\underline{j}(\{u_\nu\}_\nu, t) = \sum_{\gamma \geq \nu+1} 2^{-\gamma} J(u_\gamma, 2^\gamma) \quad \text{for } t \in [2^\nu, 2^{\nu+1}),$$

and the infimum is taken over all representations of x as in (2.4). Clearly, the function $\underline{j}(\{u_\nu\}_\nu, t)$ takes only countably many values. Thus, we may call $(X_0, X_1)_{F,\underline{j}}$ as a discrete interpolation method. As in the case of real interpolation methods, this discrete version is equivalent to the continuous version described earlier. More precisely, we have:

Lemma 2.3. *Let $x \in X_0 + X_1$. Then $x \in (X_0, X_1)_{F,j}$ if and only if $x \in (X_0, X_1)_{F,\underline{j}}$. More precisely, the following inequalities hold:*

$$\frac{1}{4}\big\|x\big\|_{F,j} \leq \big\|x\big\|_{F,\underline{j}} \leq 4\big\|x\big\|_{F,j}.$$

The verification of Lemma 2.3 is a simple adaptation of standard arguments from interpolation theory which we leave for the reader (see [7]).

Combining [4, Theorem 9.3], [5, Theorem 3.5], and Lemma 2.3, we may state the following result which is one of the decisive tools we use in our proof.

Theorem 2.4. *If E is a symmetric Banach function space on $(0, \infty)$ with the Fatou property then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $1 < p < p_E \leq q_E < q < \infty$.
- (ii) *There exists a symmetric Banach function space F on $(0, \infty)$ with nontrivial Boyd indices such that:*

$$E = (L_p(0, \infty), L_q(0, \infty))_{F,\underline{j}} \quad \textit{(with equivalent norms).}$$

As is now well-known, the preceding interpolation result automatically lifts to the noncommutative setting (see [40, Corollary 2.2]):

Corollary 2.5. *Let E be a symmetric Banach function space on $(0, \infty)$ with the Fatou property. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $1 < p < p_E \leq q_E < q < \infty$.
- (ii) *There exists a symmetric Banach function space F on $(0, \infty)$ with nontrivial Boyd indices such that for every semifinite von Neumann algebra $(\mathcal{N}, \sigma)$,*

$$E(\mathcal{N}, \sigma) = (L_p(\mathcal{N}, \sigma), L_q(\mathcal{N}, \sigma))_{F,\underline{j}},$$

with equivalent norms depending only on E, p, and q.

We record a general fact about interpolations of linear operators between two noncommutative spaces for further use.

Proposition 2.6 ([17]). *Assume that $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_p, L_q)$ and $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are semifinite von Neumann algebras. Let $T : L_p(\mathcal{M}) + L_q(\mathcal{M}) \to L_p(\mathcal{N}) + L_q(\mathcal{N})$ be a linear operator such that $T : L_p(\mathcal{M}) \to L_p(\mathcal{N})$ and $T : L_q(\mathcal{M}) \to L_q(\mathcal{N})$ are bounded. Then T maps $E(\mathcal{M})$ into $E(\mathcal{N})$ and the resulting operator $T : E(\mathcal{M}) \to E(\mathcal{N})$ is bounded. Moreover, we have the following estimate:*

$$\big\|T : E(\mathcal{M}) \to E(\mathcal{N})\big\| \leq C \max\big\{\big\|T : L_p(\mathcal{M}) \to L_p(\mathcal{N})\big\|, \big\|T : L_q(\mathcal{M}) \to L_q(\mathcal{N})\big\|\big\}$$

for some absolute constant C.

2.3. **Noncommutative martingales.** Let us now recall the general setup for noncommutative martingales. In the sequel, we always assume that the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$ is such that $\mathcal{M}_*$ is separable. Denote by $(\mathcal{M}_n)_{n\geq 1}$ an increasing sequence of von Neumann subalgebras of $\mathcal{M}$ whose union is weak*-dense in $\mathcal{M}$. For $n \geq 1$, we assume that there exists a trace preserving conditional expectation $\mathcal{E}_n$ from $\mathcal{M}$ onto $\mathcal{M}_n$. It is well-known that if τ_n denotes the restriction of τ on $\mathcal{M}_n$, then $\mathcal{E}_n$ extends to a contractive projection from $L_p(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ onto $L_p(\mathcal{M}_n, \tau_n)$ for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. More generally, if E is a symmetric Banach function space on $(0, \infty)$ which is an interpolation space of the couple $(L_1(0, \infty), L_\infty(0, \infty))$ then $\mathcal{E}_n$ is bounded from $E(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ onto $E(\mathcal{M}_n, \tau_n)$.

Definition 2.7. A sequence $x = (x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ in $L_1(\mathcal{M})$ is called *a noncommutative martingale* with respect to $(\mathcal{M}_n)_{n\geq 1}$ if $\mathcal{E}_n(x_{n+1}) = x_n$ for every $n \geq 1$.

If in addition, all x_n's belong to $E(\mathcal{M})$ then x is called an $E(\mathcal{M})$-martingale. In this case we set

$$\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} = \sup_{n\geq 1} \|x_n\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}.$$

If $\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} < \infty$, then x is called a bounded $E(\mathcal{M})$-martingale.

Let $x = (x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a noncommutative martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{M}_n)_{n\geq 1}$. Define $dx_n = x_n - x_{n-1}$ for $n \geq 1$ with the usual convention that $x_0 = 0$. The sequence $dx = (dx_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is called the *martingale difference sequence* of x. A martingale x is called *a finite martingale* if there exists N such that $dx_n = 0$ for all $n \geq N$. In the sequel, for any operator $x \in E(\mathcal{M})$, we denote $x_n = \mathcal{E}_n(x)$ for $n \geq 1$. It is well-known that if $1 < p < \infty$ and $x = (x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a bounded $L_p(\mathcal{M})$-martingale then there exists $x_\infty \in L_p(\mathcal{M})$ such that $x_n = \mathcal{E}_n(x_\infty)$ (for all $n \geq 1$) and $\|x\|_p = \|x_\infty\|_p$. For the general context of symmetric spaces, if $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_p, L_q)$ for $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and satisfies the Fatou property, then any bounded $E(\mathcal{M})$-martingale $x = (x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is of the form $(\mathcal{E}_n(x_\infty))_{n\geq 1}$ where $x_\infty \in E(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying $\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \simeq_E \|x_\infty\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}$, with equality if E is an exact interpolation space. Indeed, by reflexivity, such statement can be readily verified for $L_p(\mathcal{M}) + L_q(\mathcal{M})$ and for general such E, it follows from the fact that $E(\mathcal{M})$ semi-embeds into $L_p(\mathcal{M}) + L_q(\mathcal{M})$. Because of these facts, we often identify martingales with measurable operators when appropriate.

Let us now review the definitions of Hardy spaces and conditioned Hardy spaces of noncommutative martingales. Throughout, E is a symmetric function space on $(0, \infty)$ with the additional properties that it satisfies the Fatou property and $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_1, L_\infty)$.

We define the column space $E(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^c)$ to be the linear space of all sequences $(a_n)_{n\geq 1} \subset E(\mathcal{M})$ such that the infinite column matrix $\sum_{n\geq 1} a_n \otimes e_{n,1} \in E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N})))$ where $B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}))$ is the algebra of all bounded operators on the Hilbert space $\ell_2(\mathbb{N})$ equipped with its usual trace tr and $(e_{n,m})_{n,m\geq 1}$ denotes the collection of all unit matrices in $B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}))$. It is not difficult to verify that the linear subspace $\{\sum_{n\geq 1} a_n \otimes e_{n,1} : (a_n)_n \in E(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^c)\}$ is closed in $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2))$and therefore we equip $E(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)$ with the norm

$$\Big\|(a_n)_{n\geq 1}\Big\|_{E(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)} := \Big\|\sum_{n\geq 1} a_n\otimes e_{n,1}\Big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2))} = \Big\|\big(\sum_{n\geq 1}|a_n|^2\big)^{1/2}\Big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})},$$

then it becomes a Banach space. We can also define the corresponding row space $E(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^r)$ to be the space of all sequences $(a_n)_{n\geq 1}\subset E(\mathcal{M})$ for which $(a_n^*)_{n\geq 1}\in E(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)$ equipped with the norm

$$\Big\|(a_n)_{n\geq 1}\Big\|_{E(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^r)} = \Big\|(a_n^*)_{n\geq 1}\Big\|_{E(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)}.$$

Following [39], we consider the column and row versions of square functions relative to a martingale $x=(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ as follows:

$$S_c(x) = \Big(\sum_{k\geq 1}|dx_k|^2\Big)^{1/2} \text{ and } S_r(x) = \Big(\sum_{k\geq 1}|dx_k^*|^2\Big)^{1/2},$$

where convergences can be taken with respect to the measure topology. Define $\mathcal{H}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ (respectively, $\mathcal{H}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$) to be the set of all martingales $x=(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ in $E(\mathcal{M})$ for which the martingale difference sequence $(dx_n)_{n\geq 1}\in E(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)$ (respectively, $E(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^r)$) equipped with the norm $\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^c} = \|(dx_n)_{n\geq 1}\|_{E(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)}$ (respectively, $\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^r} = \|(dx_n)_{n\geq 1}\|_{E(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^r)}$). It is easy to verify that since conditional expectations are bounded in $E(\mathcal{M})$, the normed spaces $\mathcal{H}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{H}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ embed isometrically into $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N})))$ with closed ranges and therefore they are Banach spaces. Moreover, one can see from its definition that $\mathcal{H}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ is simply the space of all martingales $x=(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ in $E(\mathcal{M})$ for which $\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^c} = \|S_c(x)\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}<\infty$. Similar statement is also valid for $\mathcal{H}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$.

We now turn to the mixture Hardy spaces of noncommutative martingales. From the above discussions, the spaces $\mathcal{H}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{H}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ are compatible in the sense that they continuously embed into the larger space $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N})))$. The Hardy space $\mathcal{H}_E(\mathcal{M})$ is defined as follows. For $1\leq p_E\leq q_E<2$,

$$\mathcal{H}_E(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{H}_E^c(\mathcal{M}) + \mathcal{H}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_E} = \inf\big\{\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^c} + \|z\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^r}\big\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all $y\in\mathcal{H}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ and $z\in\mathcal{H}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ such that $x=y+z$. For $2\leq p_E\leq q_E<\infty$,

$$\mathcal{H}_E(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{H}_E^c(\mathcal{M})\cap\mathcal{H}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_E} = \max\big\{\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^c},\ \|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^r}\big\}.$$

These definitions mirror the well-documented difference between the two cases $1\leq p<2$ and $2\leq p<\infty$ for the special case where $E=L_p(0,\infty)$. We refer to [14] and [22] for more information and results related to space $\mathcal{H}_E(\mathcal{M})$.

We now consider the conditioned versions of the above definitions. Our approach is based on the conditioned spaces introduced by Junge in [26]. Since this is very crucial in the sequel, we review the basic setup. Below, we use the convention that $\mathcal{E}_0=\mathcal{E}_1$.

Let $\mathcal{E}:\mathcal{M}\to\mathcal{N}$ be a normal faithful conditional expectation, where $\mathcal{N}$ is a von Neumann subalgebra of $\mathcal{M}$. For $0<p\leq\infty$, we define the conditioned space $L_p^c(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{E})$ to be the completion of $\mathcal{M}\cap L_p(\mathcal{M})$ with respect to the quasi-norm

$$\big\|x\big\|_{L_p^c(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{E})} = \big\|\mathcal{E}(x^*x)\big\|_{p/2}^{1/2}.$$

It was shown in [26] that for every n and $0 < p \leq \infty$, there exists an isometric right $\mathcal{M}_n$-module map $u_{n,p} : L_p^c(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{E}_n) \to L_p(\mathcal{M}_n; \ell_2^c)$ such that

$$u_{n,p}(x)^* u_{n,q}(y) = \mathcal{E}_n(x^* y) \otimes e_{1,1}, \tag{2.5}$$

for all $x \in L_p^c(\mathcal{M}; \mathcal{E}_n)$ and $y \in L_q^c(\mathcal{M}; \mathcal{E}_n)$ with $1/p + 1/q \leq 1$. We now consider the increasing sequence of expectations $(\mathcal{E}_n)_{n\geq 1}$. Denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the collection of all finite sequences $(a_n)_{n\geq 1}$ in $L_1(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathcal{M}$. For $0 < p \leq \infty$, define the space $L_p^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^c)$ to be the completion of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the norm:

$$\big\|(a_n)\big\|_{L_p^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)} = \big\|\big(\sum_{n\geq 1} \mathcal{E}_{n-1}|a_n|^2\big)^{1/2}\big\|_p. \tag{2.6}$$

The space $L_p^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^c)$ can be isometrically embedded into an L_p-space associated to a semifinite von Neumann algebra by means of the following map:

$$U_p : L_p^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^c) \to L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes} B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$$

defined by setting

$$U_p((a_n)_{n\geq 1}) = \sum_{n\geq 1} u_{n-1,p}(a_n) \otimes e_{n,1}$$

where as above, $(e_{i,j})_{i,j\geq 1}$ is the family of unit matrices in $B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}))$. From (2.5), it follows that if $(a_n)_{n\geq 1} \in L_p^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^c)$ and $(b_n)_{n\geq 1} \in L_q^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^c)$ for $1/p + 1/q \leq 1$ then

$$U_p((a_n))^* U_q((b_n)) = \big(\sum_{n\geq 1} \mathcal{E}_{n-1}(a_n^* b_n)\big) \otimes e_{1,1} \otimes e_{1,1}. \tag{2.7}$$

In particular, $\|(a_n)\|_{L_p^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)} = \|U_p((a_n))\|_p$ and hence U_p is indeed an isometry. We note that U_p is independent of p in the sense of interpolation. Below, we will simply write U for U_p. We refer the reader to [26] and [28] for more details on the preceding construction.

Now, we generalize the notion of conditioned spaces to the setting of symmetric spaces. We consider the algebraic linear map U restricted to the linear space $\mathcal{F}$ that takes its values in $L_1(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes} B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))) \cap \mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes} B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))$. For a given sequence $(a_n)_{n\geq 1} \in \mathcal{F}$, we set:

$$\big\|(a_n)\big\|_{E^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)} = \big\|\big(\sum_{n\geq 1} \mathcal{E}_{n-1}|a_n|^2\big)^{1/2}\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} = \big\|U((a_n))\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes} B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))}.$$

This is well-defined and induces a norm on the linear space $\mathcal{F}$. We define the Banach space $E^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^c)$ to be the completion of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the above norm. Then U extends to an isometry from $E^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^c)$ into $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes} B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$ which we will still denote by U.

Similarly, we may define the corresponding row version $E^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^r)$ which can also be viewed as a subspace of $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes} B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$ as row vectors. This is done by simply considering adjoint operators.

Now, let $x = (x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a finite martingale in $L_2(\mathcal{M}) + \mathcal{M}$. We set

$$s_c(x) = \Big(\sum_{k\geq 1} \mathcal{E}_{k-1}|dx_k|^2\Big)^{1/2} \text{ and } \ s_r(x) = \Big(\sum_{k\geq 1} \mathcal{E}_{k-1}|dx_k^*|^2\Big)^{1/2}.$$

These are called the column and row conditioned square functions, respectively. Let $\mathcal{F}_M$ denote the set of all finite martingales in $L_1(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathcal{M}$. Define $\mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ (respectively, $\mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$) as the completion of $\mathcal{F}_M$ under the norm $\|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c} = \|s_c(x)\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}$ (respectively, $\|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r} = \|s_r(x)\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}$). We observe that for every $x \in \mathcal{F}_M$, $\|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c} = \|(dx_n)\|_{E^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)}$. Therefore, $\mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ may be viewed as a subspace of $E^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M}; \ell_2^c)$. More precisely, we consider the map $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{F}_M \to \mathcal{F}$ by setting $\mathcal{D}(x) = (dx_n)_{n\geq 1}$. Then $\mathcal{D}$ extends to an isometry from $\mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ into $E^{\mathrm{cond}}(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)$ which we will denote by $\mathcal{D}_c$. In the sequel, we will make frequent use of the isometric embedding:

$$U\mathcal{D}_c : \mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M}) \to E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))).$$

We can make similar assertions for the row case. That is, $\mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ embeds isometrically into $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$. We also need the diagonal Hardy space $\mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$ which is the space of all martingales whose martingale difference sequences belong to $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$ equipped with the norm $\|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d} := \|(dx_n)\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)}$. As above, we denote by $\mathcal{D}_d$ the isometric extension of $\mathcal{D}$ from $\mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$ into $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$. We remark that since, under our assumptions on E, conditional expectations are bounded on $E(\mathcal{M})$, it follows that $\mathcal{D}_d(\mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M}))$ is a closed subspace of $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$. This shows in particular that $\mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$ is a Banach space. Using the natural von Neumann algebra embeddings, $\ell_\infty \subset B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N})) \subset B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))$, we can further state that $\mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$ embeds isometrically into $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$. Consequently, $\mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$, $\mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$, and $\mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ are compatible as all three isometrically embed into the larger Banach space $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$. We define the conditioned version of martingale Hardy spaces as follows. If $1 \leq p_E \leq q_E < 2$, then

$$\mathsf{h}_E(\mathcal{M}) = \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M}) + \mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M}) + \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E} = \inf\big\{\|w\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d} + \|y\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c} + \|z\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r}\big\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all $w \in \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M}), y \in \mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$, and $z \in \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ such that $x = w + y + z$. If $2 \leq p_E \leq q_E < \infty$, then

$$\mathsf{h}_E(\mathcal{M}) = \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E} = \max\big\{\|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d}, \|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c}, \|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r}\big\}.$$

For the case where $E = L_p(0,\infty)$, we will simply write $\mathcal{H}_p(\mathcal{M})$, $\mathsf{h}_p(\mathcal{M})$, ect. in place of $\mathcal{H}_{L_p}(\mathcal{M})$, $\mathsf{h}_{L_p}(\mathcal{M})$, ect. From the noncommutative Burkholder-Gundy inequalities and noncommutative Burkholder inequalities proved in [29, 39], we have

$$\mathcal{H}_p(\mathcal{M}) = \mathsf{h}_p(\mathcal{M}) = L_p(\mathcal{M})$$

with equivalent norms for all $1 < p < \infty$. The latter equality constitutes the primary topic of this paper.

We collect some basic properties of these various Hardy spaces for further use.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $1 \leq p < q < \infty$ and assume that $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_p, L_q)$.*

(i) *$\mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$ is complemented in $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$ and $\mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M}) \in \mathrm{Int}(\mathsf{h}_p^d(\mathcal{M}), \mathsf{h}_q^d(\mathcal{M}))$;*

(ii) *If $1 < p < q < \infty$, then $\mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ is complemented in $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$ and for $s \in \{c, r\}$, then $\mathsf{h}_E^s(\mathcal{M}) \in \mathrm{Int}(\mathsf{h}_p^s(\mathcal{M}), \mathsf{h}_q^s(\mathcal{M}))$.*

Proof. For the first item, the complementation follows immediately from the simple fact that the map $\Theta : L_r(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty) \to L_r(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$ defined by:

$$\Theta\big((a_n)_{n\geq 1}\big) = (\mathcal{E}_n(a_n) - \mathcal{E}_{n-1}(a_n))_{n\geq 1}$$

is a bounded projection for all $1 \leq r < \infty$. By the interpolation result stated in Proposition 2.6, $\Theta : E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty) \to E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$ is a bounded projection and it is clear that its range is $\mathcal{D}_d(\mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M}))$. The interpolation is an obvious consequence of the complementation result.

The second item is also a consequence of the known fact from [26] that if $1 < r < \infty$, $\mathsf{h}_r^c(\mathcal{M})$ is complemented in $L_r(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$. Indeed, let $\Lambda : L_r(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))) \to L_r(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$

be the bounded projection whose range is $U\mathcal{D}_c(\mathsf{h}_r^c(\mathcal{M}))$ for all $1 < r < \infty$. It is known that Λ is independent of r in the sense of interpolation ([26, 29]). We deduce that it is also a bounded projection from $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$ onto $U\mathcal{D}_c(\mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M}))$. The statement about the range comes from the facts that on one hand, $U\mathcal{D}_c(\mathcal{F}_M) \subset \Lambda\big[E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))\big]$, and on the other hand, $\bigcup_{n\geq 1}\left[L_1(\mathcal{M}_n\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))\cap \mathcal{M}_n\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))\right]$ is a dense subset of $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$ whose image $\bigcup_{n\geq 1}\Lambda\big[L_1(\mathcal{M}_n\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))\cap \mathcal{M}_n\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))\big] \subseteq U\mathcal{D}_c(\mathcal{F}_M)$. This shows that $\Lambda\big[E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))\big] = U\mathcal{D}_c(\mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M}))$. As in the first item, the statement on interpolation follows immediately from the complementation result. □

Remark 2.9. Unlike the L_p-case, general descriptions of the duals of these more general conditioned Hardy spaces appear to be unavailable . One of the difficulties that arises in trying to develop such duality theory lies on the fact that, in some cases, E^* may not be a function space. For instance, if $E = L_{r,\infty}$ for $1 \leq p < r < q < \infty$, then $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_p, L_q)$, has the Fatou property, but E^* is highly nontrivial.

The next theorem is the main result of this section. Its main feature is that it gives a decomposition that provides norms estimates simultaneously for all $p \in (1, 2)$. This fact is very crucial in our approach in the next section. Before formally stating this result, we should clarify that when $1 < p < 2$, the noncommutative Burkholder inequalities ([29, Theorem 6.1]) imply that for each $w \in \{d, c, r\}$ there exists a bounded linear map $\xi_p^w : \mathsf{h}_p^w(\mathcal{M}) \to L_p(\mathcal{M})$. These maps are one to one as they come from the isomorphism $\mathsf{h}_p(\mathcal{M}) \approx L_p(\mathcal{M})$ and the definition of $\mathsf{h}_p(\mathcal{M}) = \mathsf{h}_p^d(\mathcal{M}) + \mathsf{h}_c^d(\mathcal{M}) + \mathsf{h}_p^r(\mathcal{M})$. As a result, any element of $\mathsf{h}_p^w(\mathcal{M})$ can be uniquely represented as measurable operator from $L_p(\mathcal{M})$. This justifies the use of identification in item (i) in the statement of the next theorem.

Theorem 2.10. *There exists a family $\{\kappa_p : 1 < p < 2\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying the following: if $x \in L_1(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_2(\mathcal{M})$, then there exist $a \in \bigcap_{1<p<2}\mathsf{h}_p^d(\mathcal{M})$, $b \in \bigcap_{1<p<2}\mathsf{h}_p^c(\mathcal{M})$, and $c \in \bigcap_{1<p<2}\mathsf{h}_p^r(\mathcal{M})$ such that:*

(i) *$x = a + b + c$;*
(ii) *for every $1 < p < 2$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\|a\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^d} + \|b\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^c} + \|c\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^r} \leq \kappa_p \|x\|_p.$$

Proof. **Case 1.** Assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is finite and τ is a normalized trace. The proof uses a weak-type decomposition from [43]. We consider the interpolation couple $(L_1(\mathcal{M}), L_2(\mathcal{M}))$.

Let $x \in L_2(\mathcal{M})$. According to [7, Lemma 3.3.2], there is a representation $x = \sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}} u_\nu$ (convergent in $L_1(\mathcal{M})$) of x satisfying, for every $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$J(u_\nu, 2^\nu) \leq 4K(x, 2^\nu). \tag{2.8}$$

Since $\tau(\mathbf{1}) = 1$, we may apply [43, Theorem 3.1]. The statement of [43, Theorem 3.1] is only for finite martingales but the construction used there can be applied verbatim to the case of infinite $L_2(\mathcal{M})$-bounded martingales. There exists an absolute constant $\kappa > 0$ such that, for each $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$, we can find three adapted sequences $\alpha^{(\nu)}$, $\beta^{(\nu)}$, and $\gamma^{(\nu)}$ in $L_2(\mathcal{M})$ such that:

$$d_n(u_\nu) = \alpha_n^{(\nu)} + \beta_n^{(\nu)} + \gamma_n^{(\nu)} \text{ for all } n \geq 1, \tag{2.9}$$

$$J\big(\sum_{n\geq 1} \alpha_n^{(\nu)} \otimes e_n, t\big) \leq \kappa J(u_\nu, t),\ t > 0, \tag{2.10}$$

$$J\big(\big(\sum_{n\geq 1}\mathcal{E}_{n-1}(|\beta_n^{(\nu)}|^2)\big)^{1/2},t\big) \leq \kappa J(u_\nu,t),\ t>0, \tag{2.11}$$

$$J\big(\big(\sum_{n\geq 1}\mathcal{E}_{n-1}(|\gamma_n^{(\nu)*}|^2)\big)^{1/2},t\big) \leq \kappa J(u_\nu,t),\ t>0, \tag{2.12}$$

where the J-functional in the left hand side of the inequality in (2.10) is taken relative to the interpolation couple $(L_{1,\infty}(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty), L_2(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty))$ and those from the left hand sides of (2.11) and (2.12) are taken with respect to the interpolation couple $(L_{1,\infty}(\mathcal{M}), L_2(\mathcal{M}))$. We set

$$\alpha_n=\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}\alpha_n^{(\nu)},\ \beta_n=\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}\beta_n^{(\nu)},\ \text{and}\ \gamma_n=\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}\gamma_n^{(\nu)}.$$

Then we obtain three adapted sequence $\alpha=(\alpha_n)_n$, $\beta=(\beta_n)_n$, and $\gamma=(\gamma_n)_n$. Define the martingale difference sequences

$$da_n=\alpha_n-\mathcal{E}_{n-1}(\alpha_n),\ db_n=\beta_n-\mathcal{E}_{n-1}(\beta_n),\ \text{and}\ dc_n=\gamma_n-\mathcal{E}_{n-1}(\gamma_n).$$

We claim that the resulting martingales a, b, and c satisfy the conclusion of the theorem. Indeed, it is clear from the construction that $x=a+b+c$. For the second item, we will verify the statement separately for a, b, and c. We begin with the martingale a. This will be deduced from the next lemma. For $0<\theta<1$, $1<p<2$, and an interpolation couple (X_0,X_1), $(X_0,X_1)_{\theta,p,\underline{J}}$ and $(X_0,X_1)_{\theta,p,\underline{K}}$ denote the discrete real interpolation methods using the J-functionals and K-functionals, respectively. We refer to [7] for definitions.

Lemma 2.11. *For every $0<\theta<1$ and every $1<p<2$,*

$$\Big\|(\alpha_n)_{n\geq 1}\Big\|_{[L_{1,\infty}(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty),L_2(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)]_{\theta,p;\underline{J}}} \leq 4\kappa\|x\|_{[L_1(\mathcal{M}),L_2(\mathcal{M})]_{\theta,p;\underline{K}}}.$$

For $\nu\in\mathbb{Z}$, let $[\alpha]^{(\nu)}=\sum_n\alpha_n^{(\nu)}\otimes e_n$. The series $\sum_\nu[\alpha]^{(\nu)}$ is a representation of $\sum_n\alpha_n\otimes e_n$. Then the lemma follows immediately from combining (2.8) and (2.10).

Fix $1<p<2$ and $1/p=(1-\theta)+\theta/2$. We appeal to the known facts from [40] that for any semifinite von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{N}$, we have

$$L_p(\mathcal{N})=\big[L_{1,\infty}(\mathcal{N}),L_2(\mathcal{N})\big]_{\theta,p,\underline{J}}\ \text{and}\ L_p(\mathcal{N})=\big[L_1(\mathcal{N}),L_2(\mathcal{N})\big]_{\theta,p,\underline{K}}.$$

The above lemma yields a constant c_p such that

$$\Big(\sum_n\|\alpha_n\|_p^p\Big)^{1/p}=\Big\|(\alpha_n)_{n\geq 1}\Big\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)}\leq c_p\big\|x\big\|_p.$$

Applying the fact that conditional expectations are contractive projections in $L_p(\mathcal{M})$ gives

$$\big\|a\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^d}\leq 2c_p\big\|x\big\|_p.$$

Now we sketch the argument for b. We consider the conditioned spaces involved as subspaces of L_r-spaces associated to $\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))$ for appropriate values of r. Then for every $\nu\in\mathbb{Z}$,

$$J\big(\big(\sum_{n\geq 1}\mathcal{E}_{n-1}(|\beta_n^{(\nu)}|^2)\big)^{1/2},2^\nu\big)=J\left(\beta^{(\nu)},2^\nu;L_{1,\infty}(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))),L_2(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))\right).$$

Therefore, (2.11) becomes,

$$J\left(\beta^{(\nu)},2^\nu;L_{1,\infty}(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))),L_2(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))\right)\leq\kappa J(u_\nu,2^\nu). \tag{2.13}$$

Using similar argument as in the estimate of norm of α with $\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty$ replaced by $\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell^2(\mathbb{N}^2))$, we get as in Lemma 2.11 that for every $0<\theta<1$ and $1<p<2$,

$$\big\|\beta\big\|_{[L_{1,\infty}(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))),L_2(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))]_{\theta,p;\underline{J}}} \leq 4\kappa\big\|x\big\|_{[L_1(\mathcal{M}),L_2(\mathcal{M})]_{\theta,p;\underline{K}}}.$$

As in the previous case, applying real interpolations with appropriate values of θ and p gives that for every $1<p<2$,

$$\big\|\beta\big\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))} \leq c_p\big\|x\big\|_p.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\Big\|\big(\sum_{n\geq 1}\mathcal{E}_{n-1}(|\beta_n|^2)\big)^{1/2}\Big\|_p \leq c_p\big\|x\big\|_p.$$

Using Kadison's inequality $\mathcal{E}_{n-1}(\beta_n)^*\mathcal{E}_{n-1}(\beta_n)\leq \mathcal{E}_{n-1}|\beta_n|^2$ for all $n\geq 1$, we deduce that

$$\big\|b\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^c} \leq 2c_p\big\|x\big\|_p.$$

Similar argument can be applied to the sequence γ to deduce the corresponding estimate

$$\big\|c\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^r} \leq 2c_p\big\|x\big\|_p.$$

Combining the above three estimates clearly provides the second item in the statement of the theorem. This completes the proof for the finite case.

Case 2. Assume now that $\mathcal{M}$ is infinite. Since $\mathcal{M}_*$ is separable, the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$ is σ-finite. We note first that Case 1 extends easily to any finite case with the trace τ being not necessarily normalized (with the same constants as in the case of normalized trace). Since there is a trace preserving conditional expectation $\mathcal{E}_1:\mathcal{M}\to\mathcal{M}_1$, it is known that $\tau|_{\mathcal{M}_1}$ remains semifinite.

Fix an increasing sequence of projections $(e_k)_{k\geq 1}\subset\mathcal{M}_1$ with $\tau(e_k)<\infty$ for all $k\geq 1$ and such that $(e_k)_{k\geq 1}$ converges to $\mathbf{1}$ for the strong operator topology. For each k, consider the finite von Neumann algebra $(e_k\mathcal{M}e_k,\tau|_{e_k\mathcal{M}e_k})$ with the filtration $(e_k\mathcal{M}_n e_k)_{n\geq 1}$. If we denote by $\mathcal{E}_n^{(k)}$ the trace preserving conditional expectation from $e_k\mathcal{M}e_k$ onto $e_k\mathcal{M}_n e_k$ then $\mathcal{E}_n^{(k)}$ is just the restriction of $\mathcal{E}_n$ on $e_k\mathcal{M}e_k$. This is the case since the e_k's were chosen from the smallest subalgebra $\mathcal{M}_1$. Therefore, if $y\in e_k\mathcal{M}e_k$ then one can easily verify that

$$\big\|y\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^d(e_k\mathcal{M}e_k)}=\big\|y\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^d(\mathcal{M})},\ \big\|y\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^c(e_k\mathcal{M}e_k)}=\big\|y\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^c(\mathcal{M})},\ \text{and}\ \big\|y\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^r(e_k\mathcal{M}e_k)}=\big\|y\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^r(\mathcal{M})}.$$

Let $x\in L_2(\mathcal{M})\cap L_1(\mathcal{M})$. For each $k\geq 1$, $e_kxe_k\in L_2(e_k\mathcal{M}e_k)$. From Case 1., there exists a decomposition $e_kxe_k=a^{(k)}+b^{(k)}+c^{(k)}$ with the property that for every $1<p<2$,

$$\big\|a^{(k)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^d}+\big\|b^{(k)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^c}+\big\|c^{(k)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^r}\leq\kappa_p\big\|e_kxe_k\big\|_p.$$

Fix an ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ on $\mathbb{N}$ containing the Fréchet filter. For any given $1<p<2$, the weak-limit along the ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ of the sequence $(a^{(k)})_{k\geq 1}$ exists in $\mathsf{h}_p^d(\mathcal{M})$. It is crucial here to observe that such weak-limits are independent of p (since they are automatically weak-limits of the same sequence in $L_1(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)+L_2(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$). Similar observations can be made with the sequences $(b^{(k)})_{k\geq 1}$ and $(c^{(k)})_{k\geq 1}$. Set

$$a=\text{w-}\lim_{k,\mathcal{U}}a^{(k)},\quad b=\ \text{w-}\lim_{k,\mathcal{U}}b^{(k)},\quad\text{and}\quad c=\ \text{w-}\lim_{k,\mathcal{U}}c^{(k)}$$

in $\mathsf{h}_p^d(\mathcal{M})$, $\mathsf{h}_p^c(\mathcal{M})$, and $\mathsf{h}_p^r(\mathcal{M})$, respectively. We also observe that for every $1<p<2$, it is easy to verify that $\lim_{k\to\infty}\|e_kxe_k-x\|_p=0$. A fortiori, $\lim_{k,\mathcal{U}}\|e_kxe_k-x\|_p=0$. All these facts lead to the decomposition:

$$x=a+b+c.$$

Furthermore, for every $1 < p < 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|a\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^d} + \big\|b\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^c} + \big\|c\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^r} &\leq \sup_k \Big\{ \big\|a^{(k)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^d} + \big\|b^{(k)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^c} + \big\|c^{(k)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_p^r} \Big\} \\ &\leq \kappa_p \sup_k \big\|e_k x e_k\big\|_p \leq \kappa_p \big\|x\big\|_p\end{aligned}$$

where κ_p is the constant from Case 1. The proof is complete. □

Remarks 2.12. 1) Since the noncommutative Burkholder inequalities do not hold for $p = 1$, the validity of our simultaneous decomposition can not include the left endpoint of the interval $(1, 2)$. On the other hand, using known estimates from real interpolation (θ, p, K) and (θ, p, J) methods of classical Lebesgue spaces, we can derive that there is an absolute constant C such that for $1/p = (1 - \theta) + \theta/2$, we have $\kappa_p \leq C\theta^{-2}(1-\theta)^{-1/2-1/p}$. It follows that κ_p is of order $(p-1)^{-2}$ when $p \to 1$ and of order $(2-p)^{-1}$ when $p \to 2$. In particular, our method of proof does not allow any extension of the decomposition to any of the endpoints of the interval $[1, 2]$. As we only get that $\kappa_p = O((p-1)^{-2})$ when $p \to 1$, our arguments do not yield the optimal order for the constants for the noncommutative Burkholder inequalities from [43].

2) Junge and Perrin also considered simultaneous type decompositions for conditioned Hardy spaces in [28]. Our Theorem 2.10 above should be compared with [28, Theorem 5.9]. See also Corollary 4.4 below for similar type simultaneous decompositions for the case of martingale Hardy space norms.

3. BURKHOLDER'S INEQUALITIES IN SYMMETRIC SPACES

The following is the principal result of this article. It provides extensions of noncommutative Burkholder's inequalities for martingales in general noncommutative symmetric spaces.

Theorem 3.1. *Let E be a symmetric Banach function space on $(0, \infty)$ satisfying the Fatou property. Assume that either $1 < p_E \leq q_E < 2$ or $2 < p_E \leq q_E < \infty$. Then*

$$E(\mathcal{M}) = \mathsf{h}_E(\mathcal{M}).$$

That is, a martingale $x = (x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded in $E(\mathcal{M})$ if and only if it belongs to $\mathsf{h}_E(\mathcal{M})$ and

$$\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \simeq_E \big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E}.$$

As noted in the introduction, the preceding theorem solves positively a question raised in [22]. The new result here is the case where $1 < p_E \leq q_E < 2$. The case $2 < p_E \leq q_E < \infty$ was established by Dirksen in [12, Theorem 6.2] but we will also provide an alternative approach for this range. We remark that under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, the Banach function space E is fully symmetric in the sense of [17] but this extra property will not be needed in the proof.

We divide the proof into four separate parts according to $1 < p_E \leq q_E < 2$ or $2 < p_E \leq q_E < \infty$, each case involving two inequalities. The main difficulty in the proof is Part II below. Part III will be deduced from Part II via duality. The other two parts will be derived from standard use of interpolations of linear operators.

3.1. The case $1 < p_E \leq q_E < 2$.

Let E be a symmetric Banach function space on $(0, \infty)$ with the Fatou property and satisfying $1 < p_E \leq q_E < 2$. Throughout the proof, we fix p and q so that $1 < p < p_E \leq q_E < q < 2$. In this case, $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_p, L_q)$.

Part I. We will verify that there exists a constant c_E such that for every $x \in \mathsf{h}_E(\mathcal{M})$, we have

$$\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \leq c_E \big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E}.$$

This is a simple consequence of the noncommutative Burkholder inequalities and Proposition 2.8. Indeed, for $1 < r < 2$, $\|x\|_r \leq c_r \|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_r^d}$. By interpolation, we deduce that $\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \leq c_E \|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})}$. Similar arguments also give $\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \leq c_E \|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})}$ and $\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \leq c_E \|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})}$.

Now, assume that $x \in \mathsf{h}_E(\mathcal{M})$ is such that $x = w + y + z$ where $w \in \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$, $y \in \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$, and $z \in \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$. Then we have

$$\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \leq c_E \big(\|w\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d} + \|y\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c} + \|z\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r} \big).$$

Taking the infimum over all decompositions $x = w + y + z$ provides the desired inequality. □

We should emphasize that the inequality from Part I may be interpreted as inclusion mappings in the following sense: if $w \in \{d, c, r\}$, then there is a natural bounded map $\xi_E^w : \mathsf{h}_E^w(\mathcal{M}) \to E(\mathcal{M})$. In fact, ξ_E^w may be taken as the bounded extension of the map $(\mathcal{F}_M, \|\cdot\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^w}) \to E(\mathcal{M})$ defined by $(x_n)_{n\geq 1} \mapsto \lim_{n\to\infty} x_n$ (since (x_n) is a finite sequence, the limit should be understood as the final value of (x_n)). We claim that these maps are one to one. To verify this claim, we consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathsf{h}_E^w(\mathcal{M}) \arrow[r, "\xi_E^w"] \arrow[d, "\iota"'] & E(\mathcal{M}) \arrow[d, "j"] \\
\mathsf{h}_p^w(\mathcal{M}) + \mathsf{h}_q^w(\mathcal{M}) \arrow[r, "\xi_{p,q}^w"] & L_p(\mathcal{M}) + L_q(\mathcal{M}),
\end{tikzcd}$$

where ι is the inclusion map from the interpolation in Proposition 2.8, j is the formal inclusion, and $\xi_{p,q}^w$ is the combination of ξ_p^w and ξ_q^w introduced in the previous section. When $z \in \mathcal{F}_M$, we clearly have $\xi_{p,q}^w \iota(z) = j \xi_E^w(z)$. Therefore, the above diagram commutes. Since ι and $\xi_{p,q}^w$ are one to one, so is ξ_E^w. As a consequence, any element $a \in \mathsf{h}_E^w(\mathcal{M})$ is uniquely associated with the operator $\xi_E^w(a) \in E(\mathcal{M})$ which we will still denote by a. In Part II below, statement such as $x = a + b + c$ for $x \in E(\mathcal{M})$, $a \in \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$, $b \in \mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$, and $c \in \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ should be understood to mean $x = \xi_E^d(a) + \xi_E^c(b) + \xi_E^r(c)$.

Part II. We consider now the reverse inequalities. That is, there exists a constant β_E such that for every $x \in E(\mathcal{M})$,

$$\|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E} \leq \beta_E \|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}.$$

The proof is much more involved and requires several steps. Our approach relies on two essential facts. As stated in Corollary 2.5, noncommutative symmetric spaces have concrete representations as interpolation spaces. The second fact is the simultaneous decomposition obtained in the previous section.

According to Corollary 2.5, we may fix a symmetric Banach function space F on $(0, \infty)$ with nontrivial Boyd indices and such that for any semifinite von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{N}$, we have:

$$E(\mathcal{N}) = \big[L_p(\mathcal{N}), L_q(\mathcal{N})\big]_{F,\underline{j}},$$

where $[\cdot,\cdot]_{F,\underline{j}}$ is the interpolation method introduced in the previous section. We begin with the following intermediate result.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $x \in L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $x^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})$, martingales $a^{(\varepsilon)} \in \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$, $b^{(\varepsilon)} \in \mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$, and $c^{(\varepsilon)} \in \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ with:*

(1) $\|x - x^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})} < \varepsilon$;

(2) $x^{(\varepsilon)} = a^{(\varepsilon)} + b^{(\varepsilon)} + c^{(\varepsilon)}$;

(3) $\|a^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d} + \|b^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c} + \|c^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r} \leq \eta_E \|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}$.

Proof. Let $x \in L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Using the interpolation couple $\big(L_p(\mathcal{M}), L_q(\mathcal{M})\big)$, fix a representation $x = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}} u_\nu$ (convergent in $L_p(\mathcal{M}) + L_q(\mathcal{M})$) such that

$$\Big\| \underline{j}\big(\{u_\nu\}_\nu, \cdot\big) \Big\|_F \leq 2 \|x\|_{F, \underline{j}}. \tag{3.1}$$

Note that the u_ν's belong to $L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})$. Using Lemma 2.1, for each $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$, we may choose $u_\nu^{(m_\nu)} \in L_1(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_2(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying the following properties:

(1) $\|u_\nu^{(m_\nu)} - u_\nu\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})} \leq \dfrac{\varepsilon}{4^{|\nu|+1}}$;

(2) $\|u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}\|_q \leq \|u_\nu\|_q$;

(3) $\|u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}\|_p \leq \|u_\nu\|_p$.

The last two conditions imply that for every $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$ and every $t > 0$,

$$J\big(u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}, t\big) \leq J\big(u_\nu, t\big),$$

which furthermore leads to the following inequality:

$$\underline{j}\big(\{u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}\}_\nu, \cdot\big) \leq \underline{j}\big(\{u_\nu\}_\nu, \cdot\big). \tag{3.2}$$

We define the operator $x^{(\varepsilon)}$ by setting:

$$x^{(\varepsilon)} = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}} u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}.$$

Then it satisfies the following norm estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{(\varepsilon)} - x\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})} &\leq \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}} \|u_\nu^{(m_\nu)} - u_\nu\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})} \\ &\leq \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\varepsilon}{4^{|\nu|+1}} \leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $x^{(\varepsilon)} \in L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})$ and the first item in the statement of Lemma 3.2 is satisfied. The crucial fact here is that all $u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}$'s in the representation of $x^{(\varepsilon)}$ belong to $L_1(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_2(\mathcal{M})$ so that Theorem 2.10 can be applied to each of the $u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}$'s. That is, for every $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exist $a_\nu \in \cap_{1<s<2} \mathsf{h}_s^d(\mathcal{M})$, $b_\nu \in \cap_{1<s<2} \mathsf{h}_s^c(\mathcal{M})$, and $c_\nu \in \cap_{1<s<2} \mathsf{h}_s^r(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying:

$$u_\nu^{(m_\nu)} = a_\nu + b_\nu + c_\nu \tag{3.3}$$

and if $s \in \{p, q\}$, then

$$\|a_\nu\|_{\mathsf{h}_s^d} + \|b_\nu\|_{\mathsf{h}_s^c} + \|c_\nu\|_{\mathsf{h}_s^r} \leq \kappa(p,q) \|u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}\|_s \tag{3.4}$$

where $\kappa(p,q) = \max\{\kappa_p, \kappa_q\}$.

For each $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$, we consider $\mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu) \in L_p(\mathcal{M} \overline{\otimes} \ell_\infty) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M} \overline{\otimes} \ell_\infty)$, $U\mathcal{D}_c(b_\nu) \in L_p(\mathcal{M} \overline{\otimes} B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M} \overline{\otimes} B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$, and $U\mathcal{D}_c(c_\nu^*) \in L_p(\mathcal{M} \overline{\otimes} B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M} \overline{\otimes} B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$.

First, we observe that (3.4) can be reinterpreted using the J-functionals as follows:

$$J\big(\mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu), t\big) \leq \kappa(p,q) J(u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}, t), \ \ t > 0, \tag{3.5}$$

$$J\big(U\mathcal{D}_c(b_\nu), t\big) \leq \kappa(p,q) J(u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}, t), \ \ t > 0, \tag{3.6}$$

$$J\big(U\mathcal{D}_c(c_\nu^*), t\big) \leq \kappa(p,q) J(u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}, t), \ \ t > 0 \tag{3.7}$$

where the J-functional on the left side of (3.5) is taken using the couple $[L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty), L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)]$ and those on the left sides of inequalities (3.6) and (3.7) were computed using the couple $[L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))), L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))]$.

We need the following properties of the sequences $\{\mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu)\}_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}$, $\{U\mathcal{D}_c(b_\nu)\}_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}$, and $\{U\mathcal{D}_c(c_\nu^*)\}_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}$. We refer to [11] for definition and criterion for unconditionally Cauchy series in Banach spaces.

Sublemma 3.3. (1) *$\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu)$ is a weakly unconditionally Cauchy series in $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$.*
(2) *$\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}U\mathcal{D}_c(b_\nu)$ and $\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}U\mathcal{D}_c(c_\nu^*)$ are weakly unconditionally Cauchy series in $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$.*

Moreover, there exists a constant κ_E such that:

$$\max\Big\{\sup_{N\geq 1}\|S_N(a)\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)}, \sup_{N\geq 1}\|S_N(b)\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))}, \sup_{N\geq 1}\|S_N(c^*)\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))}\Big\} \\ \leq \kappa_E\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})},$$

where for each $N \geq 1$, $S_N(a) = \sum_{|\nu|\leq N}\mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu)$, $S_N(b) = \sum_{|\nu|\leq N}U\mathcal{D}_c(b_\nu)$, and $S_N(c^*) = \sum_{|\nu|\leq N}U\mathcal{D}_c(c_\nu^*)$.

To verify the first item in Sublemma 3.3, we note that if S if a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}$ then it follows from (3.2) and (3.5) that

$$\underline{j}\big(\{\mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu)\}_{\nu\in S},\cdot\big) \leq \kappa(p,q)\underline{j}\big(\{u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}\}_{\nu\in S},\cdot\big) \leq \kappa(p,q)\underline{j}\big(\{u_\nu\}_\nu,\cdot\big).$$

By the definition of $[\cdot,\cdot]_{F,\underline{j}}$, for every finite sequence of scalars $(\theta_\nu)_{\nu\in S}$ with $|\theta_\nu| = 1$, we have

$$\big\|\sum_{\nu\in S}\theta_\nu\mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu)\big\|_{[L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty),L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)]_{F,\underline{j}}} \leq \kappa(p,q)\big\|\underline{j}\big(\{u_\nu\}_\nu,\cdot\big)\|_F \leq 2\kappa(p,q)\big\|x\big\|_{F,\underline{j}}$$

where the last inequality is from (3.1). Now we use the facts that

$$E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty) = \big[L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty), L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)\big]_{F,\underline{j}} \text{ and } E(\mathcal{M}) = \big[L_p(\mathcal{M}), L_q(\mathcal{M})\big]_{F,\underline{j}}$$

to deduce that there exists a constant κ_E such that:

$$\big\|\sum_{\nu\in S}\theta_\nu\mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu)\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)} \leq \kappa_E\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{3.8}$$

Since this is the case for any arbitrary finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}$, it proves that the series $\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu)$ is weakly unconditionally Cauchy in $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$.

The proof of the second item follows the same pattern. As above, if S is a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}$, then it follows from (3.2) and (3.6) that:

$$\underline{j}\big(\{U\mathcal{D}_c(b_\nu)\}_{\nu\in S},\cdot\big) \leq \kappa(p,q)\underline{j}\big(\{u_\nu^{(m_\nu)}\}_{\nu\in S},\cdot\big) \leq \kappa(p,q)\underline{j}\big(\{u_\nu\}_\nu,\cdot\big).$$

Using similar arguments as above, we may deduce that for every finite subset S of $\mathbb{Z}$ and for every sequence of scalars $(\theta_\nu)_{\nu\in S}$ with $|\theta_\nu| = 1$,

$$\big\|\sum_{\nu\in S}\theta_\nu U\mathcal{D}_c(b_\nu)\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))} \leq \kappa_E\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{3.9}$$

This again shows that the series $\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}U\mathcal{D}_c(b_\nu)$ is weakly unconditionally Cauchy in $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$. The proof for the series $\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}U\mathcal{D}_c(c_\nu^*)$ is identical so we omit the details. The inequality stated in Sublemma 3.3 follows from (3.8), (3.9), and the corresponding inequality for $\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}U\mathcal{D}_c(c_\nu^*)$. Sublemma 3.3 is verified.

Next, we note that since $L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty) + L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$ is a reflexive space, the series $\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu)$ is unconditionally convergent in $L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty) + L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$. Similarly, both series $\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}}U\mathcal{D}_c(b_\nu)$

and $\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}} U\mathcal{D}_c(c_\nu^*)$ are unconditionally convergent in $L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))) + L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$. Now we set:

$$\alpha^{(\varepsilon)} := \sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}_d(a_\nu) \in L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty) + L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty),$$

$$\beta^{(\varepsilon)} := \sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}} U\mathcal{D}_c(b_\nu) \in L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))) + L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))),$$

and

$$\gamma^{(\varepsilon)} := \sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}} U\mathcal{D}_c(c_\nu^*) \in L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))) + L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))).$$

We claim that

$$\max\Big\{\big\|\alpha^{(\varepsilon)}\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)}, \big\|\beta^{(\varepsilon)}\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))}, \big\|\gamma^{(\varepsilon)}\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))}\Big\} \leq \kappa_E\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{3.10}$$

To verify this claim, we use the fact mentioned in the previous section that for every semifinite von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{N}$, the inclusion map from $E(\mathcal{N})$ into $L_p(\mathcal{N})+L_q(\mathcal{N})$ is a semi-embedding. Indeed, if $\rho = \kappa_E\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}$, then from Sublemma 3.3, $(S_N(a))_{N\geq 1}$ is a sequence in the ρ-ball of $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$ that converges to $\alpha^{(\varepsilon)}$ for the norm topology of $L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty) + L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$. By semi-embedding, we have $\alpha^{(\varepsilon)} \in E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$ with $\|\alpha^{(\varepsilon)}\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)} \leq \rho$. Identical arguments can be applied to $\beta^{(\varepsilon)}$ and $\gamma^{(\varepsilon)}$ to deduce that $\big\|\beta^{(\varepsilon)}\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))} \leq \rho$ and $\big\|\gamma^{(\varepsilon)}\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))} \leq \rho$. We have verified (3.10).

We observe that since the sequence $(S_N(a))_N$ is from $\mathcal{D}_d(\mathsf{h}_p^d(\mathcal{M})) \cap \mathcal{D}_d(\mathsf{h}_q^d(\mathcal{M}))$, it follows that $\alpha^{(\varepsilon)} \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathsf{h}_{L_p+L_q}^d(\mathcal{M}))$. That is, there exists $a^{(\varepsilon)} \in \mathsf{h}_{L_p+L_q}^d(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\alpha^{(\varepsilon)} = \mathcal{D}_d(a^{(\varepsilon)})$. But since $\big\|\alpha^{(\varepsilon)}\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)} \leq \kappa_E\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}$, by the complementation stated in Proposition 2.8, we conclude that $a^{(\varepsilon)} \in \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$ with the norm estimate:

$$\big\|a^{(\varepsilon)}\big\|_{h_E^d} \leq \kappa_E\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}.$$

Identical arguments can be applied to the sequences $(S_N(b))_N$ and $(S_N(c))_N$ to deduce that there exist martingales $b^{(\varepsilon)} \in \mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ and $c^{(\varepsilon)} \in \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\beta^{(\varepsilon)} = U\mathcal{D}_c(b^{(\varepsilon)})$, $\gamma^{(\varepsilon)} = U\mathcal{D}_c((c^{(\varepsilon)})^*)$, and

$$\max\Big\{\big\|b^{(\varepsilon)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c}, \big\|c^{(\varepsilon)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r}\Big\} \leq \kappa_E\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}.$$

It is clear from the construction that $x^{(\varepsilon)} = a^{(\varepsilon)} + b^{(\varepsilon)} + c^{(\varepsilon)}$ and the last two inequalities clearly implies the last item in Lemma 3.2. The proof is complete. □

The next step provides the desired decomposition for all $x \in L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})$.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a constant β_E such that every $x \in L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})$ admits a decomposition $x = a + b + c$ where $a \in \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$, $b \in \mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$, and $c \in \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying:*

$$\big\|a\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d} + \big\|b\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c} + \big\|c\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r} \leq \beta_E\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}.$$

Proof. We use semi-embedding techniques. Using Lemma 3.2, we construct sequence of operators $(x^{(m)})_{m\geq 1} \subset L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})$, sequences $(a^{(m)})_{m\geq 1} \subset \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$, $(b^{(m)})_{m\geq 1} \subset \mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$, and $(c^{(m)})_{m\geq 1} \subset \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ such that:

(i) $\lim_{m\to\infty} \|x^{(m)} - x\|_{L_p(\mathcal{M})\cap L_q(\mathcal{M})} = 0$;
(ii) $x^{(m)} = a^{(m)} + b^{(m)} + c^{(m)}$ for all $m \geq 1$:
(iii) $\big\|a^{(m)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d} + \big\|b^{(m)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c} + \big\|c^{(m)}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r} \leq \eta_E\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}$.

Let $\rho = \eta_E \|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}$. Then the sequence $\{\mathcal{D}_d(a^{(m)})\}_{m\geq 1}$ belongs to the ρ-ball of $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$. Similarly, $\{U\mathcal{D}_c(b^{(m)})\}_{m\geq 1}$ and $\{U\mathcal{D}_c((c^{(m)})^*)\}_{m\geq 1}$ belong to the ρ-ball of $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$.

Since the spaces $L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)+L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$ and $L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))+L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$ are reflexive, we may assume (after taking subsequences if necessary) that $\{\mathcal{D}_d(a^{(m)})\}_{m\geq 1}$ converges to $\widetilde{a}$ for weak topology in $L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)+L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)$ and both $\{U\mathcal{D}_c(b^{(m)})\}_{m\geq 1}$ and $\{U\mathcal{D}_c((c^{(m)})^*)\}_{m\geq 1}$ converge (for the weak topology of $L_p(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))) + L_q(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))))$ to $\widetilde{b}$ and $\widetilde{c}^*$, respectively.

As a consequence of the fact that the inclusion mappings are semi-embedings, it is clear that these limits satisfy:

$$\max\Big\{\|\widetilde{a}\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)}, \|\widetilde{b}\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))}, \|\widetilde{c}^*\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))}\Big\} \leq \rho.$$

Using similar arguments as in the proof of the previous lemma, we may deduce that there exist $a \in \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M})$, $b \in \mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$, and $c \in \mathsf{h}_E^r(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\widetilde{a} = \mathcal{D}_d(a)$, $\widetilde{b} = U\mathcal{D}_c(b)$, $\widetilde{c}^* = U\mathcal{D}_c(c^*)$, and the previous inequality translates into

$$\max\Big\{\|a\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d}, \|b\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c}, \|c\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r}\Big\} \leq \rho.$$

Moreover, it is clear from (i) and (ii) that $x = a + b + c$. Thus, we have verified Lemma 3.4. $\square$

To conclude the proof of Part II, it is enough to note that since $L_p(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_q(\mathcal{M})$ is dense in $E(\mathcal{M})$. The assertion that $\big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E} \leq \beta_E \big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}$ for all $x \in E(\mathcal{M})$ then follows immediately from Lemma 3.4.

3.2. **The case** $2 < p_E \leq q_E < \infty$.

Assume now that E is a symmetric Banach function space on $(0,\infty)$ satisfying the Fatou property and $2 < p_E \leq q_E < \infty$.

Part III. We will verify that for every $x \in \mathsf{h}_E(\mathcal{M})$,

$$\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \lesssim \big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E}.$$

This will be deduced from Part II using duality. Let $E^\times$ be the Köthe dual of E. The noncommutative symmetric space $E^\times(\mathcal{M})$ is the Köthe dual of $E(\mathcal{M})$ in the sense of [18]. Since E has the Fatou property, it follows that for every $x \in E(\mathcal{M})$, we have $\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} = \|x\|_{E^{\times\times}(\mathcal{M})}$. In particular, the closed unit ball of $E^\times(\mathcal{M})$ is a norming set for $E(\mathcal{M})$.

It is enough to verify the inequality for $x \in L_1(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathcal{M}$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $y \in E^\times(\mathcal{M})$, with $\|y\|_{E^\times(\mathcal{M})} = 1$, and such that

$$(1-\varepsilon)\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \leq \tau(xy^*).$$

From [34, Proposition 2.b.2], the Boyd indices of $E^\times$ satisfy $1 < p_{E^\times} \leq q_{E^\times} < 2$. Thus, using Part II, it follows that $y \in \mathsf{h}_{E^\times}$. We may choose a decomposition $y = a + b + c$ satisfying:

$$\big\|a\big\|_{\mathsf{h}^d_{E^\times}} + \big\|b\big\|_{\mathsf{h}^c_{E^\times}} + \big\|c\big\|_{\mathsf{h}^r_{E^\times}} \leq \kappa_{E^\times} + \varepsilon.$$

From the discussion after the proof of Part I, a, b, and c can be represented by operators from $E^\times(\mathcal{M})$, which we will still denote by a, b, and c. By density, there exist $N \geq 1$, $\hat{a}$, $\hat{b}$, and $\hat{c}$ in $L_1(\mathcal{M}_N) \cap \mathcal{M}_N$ so that

$$\big\|a-\hat{a}\big\|_{h^d_{E^\times}} + \big\|a-\hat{a}\big\|_{E^\times(\mathcal{M})} < \varepsilon/3,$$

$$\big\|b-\hat{b}\big\|_{h^c_{E^\times}} + \big\|b-\hat{b}\big\|_{E^\times(\mathcal{M})} < \varepsilon/3,$$

$$\big\|c-\hat{c}\big\|_{h^r_{E^\times}} + \big\|c-\hat{c}\big\|_{E^\times(\mathcal{M})} < \varepsilon/3.$$

Now, $\tau(xy^*) = \tau(xa^*)+\tau(xb^*)+\tau(xc^*) \leq \varepsilon\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} + |\tau(x\hat{a}^*)|+|\tau(x\hat{b}^*)|+|\tau(x\hat{c}^*)| := \varepsilon\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} + I + II + II$. We estimate I, II, and III separately. Below, we denote by γ and tr the usual traces on ℓ_∞ and $B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2))$, respectively. For I, we have the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= \Big|\sum_{n=1}^{N} \tau(dx_n d\hat{a}_n^*)\Big| \\
&= \Big|\tau\otimes\gamma\big((dx_n)_{1\leq n\leq N}.(d\hat{a}_n^*)_{1\leq n\leq N}\big)\Big| \\
&\leq \big\|(dx_n)_{1\leq n\leq N}\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)}.\big\|(d\hat{a}_n)_{1\leq n\leq N}\big\|_{E^\times(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty)} \\
&= \big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d}.\big\|\hat{a}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_{E^\times}^d} \\
&\leq \big(\varepsilon/3 + \big\|a\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_{E^\times}^d}\big)\big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d}.
\end{aligned}$$

For II, we use the identifications of $\mathsf{h}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathsf{h}_{E^\times}^c(\mathcal{M})$ as subspaces of $E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$ and $E^\times(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))$, respectively. First, we write $II = \big|\sum_{n=1}^N \tau(dx_n d\hat{b}_n^*)\big|$. Since the conditional expectations $\mathcal{E}_k$'s are trace invariant, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \Big|\sum_{n=1}^{N} \tau(\mathcal{E}_{n-1}(d\hat{b}_n^* dx_n))\Big| \\
&= \Big|\tau\Big[\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathcal{E}_{n-1}(d\hat{b}_n^* dx_n)\Big]\Big|.
\end{aligned}$$

We note that $(d\hat{b}_n)_{1\leq n\leq N}$ and $(dx_n)_{1\leq n\leq N}$ are sequences from $\mathcal{F}$ and therefore (2.7) applies. We may then write

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \Big|\tau\otimes \mathrm{tr}\Big[U((d\hat{b}_n)_{1\leq n\leq N})^* U((dx_n)_{1\leq n\leq N})\Big]\Big| \\
&\leq \Big\|U((d\hat{b}_n)_{n\geq 1})\Big\|_{E^\times(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))}\Big\|U((dx_n)_{n\geq 1})\Big\|_{E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N}^2)))} \\
&= \big\|\hat{b}\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_{E^\times}^c}.\big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c} \\
&\leq (\varepsilon/3 + \big\|b\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_{E^\times}^c})\big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof that $III \leq \big(\varepsilon/3 + \big\|c\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_{E^\times}^r}\big)\big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r}$ is identical so we omit the details. Combining the above estimates on I, II, and III, we derive that

$$(1-2\varepsilon)\big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \leq (\kappa_{E^\times} + 2\varepsilon)\big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E}.$$

Taking infimum over ε gives the desired inequality.

Part IV. The remaining case is to show the reverse inequality $\big\|x\big\|_{\mathsf{h}_E} \lesssim \big\|x\big\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}$. This is an easy application of the noncommutative Burkholder inequalities for L_s-bounded martingales when $2 < s < \infty$ together with Proposition 2.8. Details are left to the reader. ☐

Remark 3.5. Our duality argument in Part III strongly relies on the theory of Köthe dualities for noncommutative symmetric space from [18]. At the time of this writing, we do not know how to incorporate this theory into martingales Hardy spaces.

For the case where $\mathcal{M}$ is a finite von Neumann algebra equipped with a normal tracial state τ, it is more natural to consider symmetric Banach function spaces defined on the interval $[0,1]$. However, the definition of the diagonal Hardy space uses the infinite von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}\ell_\infty$. In this case, we may consider an extension of symmetric Banach function space E on $[0,1]$ into a symmetric Banach function space on $(0,\infty)$ introduced in [23] (see also [1, 34] for more details).

Let Z_E^2 be the symmetric space on $(0,\infty)$ of all measurable functions f for which $\mu(f)\chi_{(0,1]} \in E$ and $\mu(f)\chi_{(1,\infty)} \in L_2(0,\infty)$, endowed with the norm

$$\|f\|_{Z_E^2} = \max\Big\{\big\|\mu(f)\chi_{(0,1]}\big\|_E, \Big(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\Big(\int_n^{n+1}\mu_u(f)\,du\Big)^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\}.$$

It was shown in [34, Theorem 2.f.1] that if E has nontrivial Boyd indices then Z_E^2 is isomorphic to E. Using the symmetric Banach function space Z_E^2 on the diagonal Hardy space, we may state the following variant of Theorem 3.1:

Theorem 3.6. *Assume that $(\mathcal{M},\tau)$ is a finite von Neumann algebra with τ being a normal tracial state and E is a symmetric Banach function space on $[0,1]$ satisfying the Fatou property. Let $x=(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a bounded $E(\mathcal{M})$-martingale.*

(1) If $1 < p_E \leq q_E < 2$, then

$$\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \simeq_E \inf\Big\{\|w\|_{\mathsf{h}^d_{Z_E^2}} + \|y\|_{\mathsf{h}^c_E} + \|z\|_{\mathsf{h}^r_E}\Big\}$$

where the infimum runs over all decompositions $x = w + y + z$ with w, y, and z are martingales.

(2) If $2 < p_E \leq q_E < \infty$, then

$$\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \simeq_E \max\Big\{\|x\|_{\mathsf{h}^d_{Z_E^2}}, \|x\|_{\mathsf{h}^c_E}, \|x\|_{\mathsf{h}^r_E}\Big\}.$$

The assumptions of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.6 are equivalent to $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_p, L_q)$ with $1 < p < q < 2$ or $2 < p < q < \infty$. Indeed, if $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_p, L_q)$ then $p \leq p_E \leq q_E \leq q$. We do not know if our results extend to the case where $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_p, L_2)$ for $1 < p < 2$ or $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_2, L_q)$ for $q > 2$. On the other hand, since $\mathsf{h}_1(\mathcal{M}) \subset L_1(\mathcal{M})$, the argument used in Part I of the proof of Theorem 3.1 can be readily adjusted to provide the following:

If $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_1, L_q)$ where $q \leq 2$, then there exists a constant c_E such that for every martingale $x \in \mathsf{h}_E(\mathcal{M})$,

$$\|x\|_{E(\mathcal{M})} \leq c_E\|x\|_{\mathsf{h}_E}.$$

Similarly, if $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_2, L_q)$ where $2 < q < \infty$, then there exists a constant c_E such that for every $y \in E(\mathcal{M})$,

$$\|y\|_{\mathsf{h}_E} \leq c_E\|y\|_{E(\mathcal{M})}.$$

We conclude this section by pointing out that as with the case of noncommutative Burkholder-Gundy inequalities, no equivalence of norms is known for the case where $1 < p_E < 2$ and $2 < q_E < \infty$.

4. FURTHER REMARKS

We begin this section with a short discussion about the comparison between martingales Hardy spaces and conditioned martingale Hardy spaces associated with general symmetric spaces. Combining Theorem 3.1 with the main result of [22], we may state:

Corollary 4.1. *Let E be a symmetric Banach function space on $(0,\infty)$ satisfying the Fatou property. Assume that either $1 < p_E \leq q_E < 2$ or $2 < p_E \leq q_E < \infty$. Then*

$$\mathcal{H}_E(\mathcal{M}) = \mathsf{h}_E(\mathcal{M}) = E(\mathcal{M}),$$

with equivalent norms.

We recall the noncommutative Davis' decomposition established in [27, 38] which states that $\mathcal{H}_1(\mathcal{M}) = \mathsf{h}_1(\mathcal{M})$. In view of this equivalence, it seems reasonable to expect that the assumption $p_E > 1$ is not needed in the first equality in Corollary 4.1. Unfortunately, our interpolation techniques are not efficient enough to apply to the case $p_E = 1$. We leave this as an open problem.

Problem 4.2. Assume that $p_E = 1$ and $q_E \leq 2$. Do we have $\mathcal{H}_E(\mathcal{M}) = \mathsf{h}_E(\mathcal{M})$?

Our next result shows a connection between the diagonal Hardy space and the row/column Hardy spaces.

Proposition 4.3. *If $q_E < 2$, then* $\max\{\|a\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^c}, \|a\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^r}\} \leq c_E \|a\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d}$.

Proof. Let $1 \leq s < 2$. It is an immediate consequence of the space $L_{s/2}(\mathcal{M})$ being a $s/2$-normed space that if $a \in \mathsf{h}_s^d(\mathcal{M})$ then $\max\{\|a\|_{\mathcal{H}_s^c}, \|a\|_{\mathcal{H}_s^r}\} \leq \|a\|_{\mathsf{h}_s^d}$. The general case can be achieved by interpolations. We appeal to a result from [2, Theorem 2 and Remark 4] which asserts that if $q_E < q < 2$, then $E \in \mathrm{Int}(L_1, L_q)$.

When $1 \leq s < 2$, it follows from above that the formal identity $\iota : \mathsf{h}_s^d(\mathcal{M}) \to \mathcal{H}_s^c(\mathcal{M})$ is a contraction. If we denote by $\jmath$ the natural isometry of $\mathcal{H}_s^c(\mathcal{M})$ into $L_s(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N})))$ then $\jmath\iota : \mathsf{h}_s^d(\mathcal{M}) \to L_s(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N})))$ is a contraction. We can now deduce from Proposition 2.8 that $\jmath\iota : \mathsf{h}_E^d(\mathcal{M}) \to E(\mathcal{M}\overline{\otimes}B(\ell_2(\mathbb{N})))$ is bounded whose range sits in $\mathcal{H}_E^c(\mathcal{M})$. This shows that $\|a\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^c} \lesssim \|a\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^d}$. We should point out here that in general, $\mathcal{H}_1^c(\mathcal{M})$ is not necessarily complemented in $L_1(\mathcal{M};\ell_2^c)$ and we do not know if $\mathcal{H}_E^c(\mathcal{M}) \in \mathrm{Int}(\mathcal{H}_1^c(\mathcal{M}), \mathcal{H}_q^c(\mathcal{M}))$. This explains the role of $\jmath$ in our argument. □

Since for $1 \leq s < 2$, we have $\|a\|_{\mathcal{H}_s^c} \leq 2^{1/s}\|a\|_{\mathsf{h}_s^c}$ for all $a \in \mathsf{h}_s^c(\mathcal{M})$ ([29, Theorem 7.1]), it is reasonable to assume that the corresponding statements to the row/column are also valid. That is, $\|a\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^c} \leq c_E\|a\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^c}$ and $\|a\|_{\mathcal{H}_E^r} \leq c_E\|a\|_{\mathsf{h}_E^r}$ for some constant c_E. But we were unable to verify these inequalities at this time.

The following consequence of Theorem 2.10 now follows from Proposition 4.3 and the facts that $\mathsf{h}_p^c(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathcal{H}_p^c(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathsf{h}_p^r(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathcal{H}_p^r(\mathcal{M})$ for $1 \leq p < 2$. It provides simultaneous decompositions for martingale Hardy spaces norms that are related to the noncommutative Burkholder-Gundy inequalities from [39].

Corollary 4.4. *There exists a family of constants $\{\kappa_p' : 1 < p < 2\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying the following: if $x \in L_1(\mathcal{M}) \cap L_2(\mathcal{M})$, then there exist martingales $y \in \cap_{1<p<2}\mathcal{H}_p^c(\mathcal{M})$ and $z \in \cap_{1<p<2}\mathcal{H}_p^r(\mathcal{M})$ such that:*

(i) *$x = y + z$;*
(ii) *for every $1 < p < 2$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\|y\|_{\mathcal{H}_p^c} + \|z\|_{\mathcal{H}_p^r} \leq \kappa_p'\|x\|_p.$$

A direct alternative approach to Corollary 4.4 is to use the weak-type inequality for square functions from [42] (see also [37]) and then follow the same line of reasoning as in the proof of

Theorem 2.10. The above result is closely related to another type of simultaneous decompositions considered by Junge and Perrin in [28, Theorem 3.3].

We note that Part I of the proof of Theorem 3.1 can also be deduced from Proposition 4.3 and the noncommutative Burkholder-Gundy inequalities for symmetric spaces from [14] and [22].

As a final remark, we provide an example involving Orlicz functions. Let Φ be an Orlicz function on $[0,\infty)$ i.e, a continuous increasing convex function on $[0,\infty)$ with $\Phi(0)=0$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty}\Phi(t)=\infty$. Two standard indices associated to the Orlicz function Φ are defined as follows: let

$$M_\Phi(t)=\sup_{s>0}\frac{\Phi(ts)}{\Phi(s)},\quad t\in[0,\infty)$$

and

$$p_\Phi:=\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{\log M_\Phi(t)}{\log t},\quad q_\Phi:=\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{\log M_\Phi(t)}{\log t}.$$

Then $1\leq p_\Phi\leq q_\Phi\leq\infty$. The Orlicz space L_Φ is the set of all Lebesgue measurable functions f defined on $(0,\infty)$ such that for some constant $c>0$,

$$\int_0^\infty \Phi\Big(|f(t)|/c\Big)\,dt<\infty.$$

If we equip L_Φ with the Luxemburg norm:

$$\big\|f\big\|_{L_\Phi}=\inf\Big\{c>0:\int_0^\infty \Phi\Big(|f(t)|/c\Big)\,dt\leq 1\Big\},$$

then L_Φ is a symmetric Banach function space with the Fatou property. Moreover, the Boyd indices of L_Φ coincide with the indices p_Φ and q_Φ (see for instance [35]). Thus, Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 4.1 apply to martingales in the noncommutative space $L_\Phi(\mathcal{M})$ whenever $1<p_\Phi\leq q_\Phi<2$ or $2<p_\Phi\leq q_\Phi<\infty$. This example also motivates the consideration of the so-called Φ-moment inequalities involving conditioned square functions. This direction will be explored in a forthcoming article. We refer to [3, 13, 15] for recent progress on moment inequalities for noncommutative martingales.

Acknowledgements. This work was carried out during the second-named author's visit to Miami University. She would like to express her gratitude to the Department of Mathematics of Miami University for its warm hospitality. The authors are indebted to the referee for helpful suggestions that improved the presentation of the paper.

References

[1] S. Astashkin, F. Sukochev, and C. P. Wong, *Disjointification of martingale differences and conditionally independent random variables with some applications*, Studia Math. **205** (2011), no. 2, 171–200.

[2] S. V. Astashkin and L. Maligranda, *Interpolation between L_1 and L_p, $1<p<\infty$*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **132** (2004), no. 10, 2929–2938 (electronic).

[3] T. Bekjan and Z. Chen, *Interpolation and Φ-moment inequalities of noncommutative martingales*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **152** (2012), no. 1-2, 179–206.

[4] C. Bennett, *Banach function spaces and interpolation methods. I. The abstract theory*, J. Funct. Anal. **17** (1974), 409–440.

[5] C. Bennett, *Banach function spaces and interpolation methods. II. Interpolation of weak-type operators*, Linear operators and approximation, II (Proc. Conf., Math. Res. Inst., Oberwolfach, 1974), Birkhäuser, Basel, 1974, pp. 129–139. Internat. Ser. Numer. Math., Vol. 25.

[6] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of operators*, Academic Press Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.

[7] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, *Interpolation spaces. An introduction*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, No. 223.

[8] D. L. Burkholder, *Distribution function inequalities for martingales*, Ann. Probab. **1** (1973), 19–42.

[9] D. L. Burkholder and R. F. Gundy, *Extrapolation and interpolation of quasi-linear operators on martingales*, Acta Math. **124** (1970), 249–304.

[10] V. I. Chilin and F. A. Sukochev, *Symmetric spaces over semifinite von Neumann algebras*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **313** (1990), 811–815.

[11] J. Diestel, *Sequences and series in Banach spaces*, Graduate Text in Mathematics, **92**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.

[12] S. Dirksen, *Noncommutative Boyd interpolation theorems*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, **367** (2015), no 6, 4079–4110.

[13] S. Dirksen, *Weak-type interpolation for noncommutative maximal operators*, arXiv:1212.5168v2 (2013).

[14] S. Dirksen, B. de Pagter, D. Potapov, and F. Sukochev, *Rosenthal inequalities in noncommutative symmetric spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **261** (2011), no. 10, 2890–2925.

[15] S. Dirksen and E. Ricard, *Some remarks on noncommutative Khintchine inequalities*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **45** (2013), no. 3, 618–624.

[16] P. G. Dodds, T. K. Dodds, and B. de Pagter, *Noncommutative Banach function spaces*, Math. Z. **201** (1989), 583–597.

[17] P. G. Dodds, T. K. Dodds, and B. de Pagter, *Fully symmetric operator spaces*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **15** (1992), no. 6, 942–972.

[18] P. G. Dodds, T. K. Dodds, and B. de Pagter, *Noncommutative Köthe duality*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **339** (1993), 717–750.

[19] T. Fack and H. Kosaki, *Generalized s-numbers of τ-measurable operators*, Pacific J. Math. **123** (1986), 269–300.

[20] A. M. Garsia, *Martingale inequalities: Seminar notes on recent progress*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, Mass.-London-Amsterdam, 1973, Mathematics Lecture Notes Series.

[21] Y. Jiao, *Burkholder's inequalities in noncommutative Lorentz spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **138** (2010), no. 7, 2431–2441.

[22] Y. Jiao, *Martingale inequalities in noncommutative symmetric spaces*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **98** (2012), no. 1, 87–97.

[23] W. B. Johnson, B. Maurey, G. Schechtman, and L. Tzafriri, *Symmetric structures in Banach spaces*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **19** (1979), no. 217, v+298.

[24] W. B. Johnson and G. Schechtman, *Martingale inequalities in rearrangement invariant function spaces*, Israel J. Math. **64** (1988), no. 3, 267–275 (1989).

[25] W. B. Johnson and G. Schechtman, *Sums of independent random variables in rearrangement invariant function spaces*, Ann. Probab. **17** (1989), no. 2, 789–808.

[26] M. Junge, *Doob's inequality for non-commutative martingales*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **549** (2002), 149–190.

[27] M. Junge and T. Mei, *Noncommutative Riesz transforms—a probabilistic approach*, Amer. J. Math. **132** (2010), no. 3, 611–680.

[28] M. Junge and M. Perrin, *Theory of $\mathcal{H}_p$-spaces for continuous filtrations in von Neumann algebras*, Astérisque (2014), no. 362, vi+134.

[29] M. Junge and Q. Xu, *Noncommutative Burkholder/Rosenthal inequalities*, Ann. Probab. **31** (2003), no. 2, 948–995.

[30] M. Junge and Q. Xu, *Noncommutative Burkholder/Rosenthal inequalities. II. Applications*, Israel J. Math. **167** (2008), 227–282.

[31] N. Kalton and S. Montgomery-Smith, *Interpolation of Banach spaces*, Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol. 2, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2003, pp. 1131–1175.

[32] N. J. Kalton and F. A. Sukochev, *Symmetric norms and spaces of operators*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **621** (2008), 81–121.

[33] C. Le Merdy and F. Sukochev, *Rademacher averages on noncommutative symmetric spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **255** (2008), no. 12, 3329–3355.

[34] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach spaces. II*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979, Function spaces.

[35] L. Maligranda, *Indices and interpolation*, Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.) **234** (1985), 49.

[36] E. Nelson, *Notes on non-commutative integration*, J. Funct. Anal. **15** (1974), 103–116.

[37] J. Parcet and N. Randrianantoanina, *Gundy's decomposition for non-commutative martingales and applications*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **93** (2006), no. 1, 227–252.

[38] M. Perrin, *A noncommutative Davis' decomposition for martingales*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **80** (2009), no. 3, 627–648.

[39] G. Pisier and Q. Xu, *Non-commutative martingale inequalities*, Comm. Math. Phys. **189** (1997), 667–698.

[40] G. Pisier and Q. Xu, *Non-commutative L^p-spaces*, Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol. 2, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2003, pp. 1459–1517.
[41] N. Randrianantoanina, *Non-commutative martingale transforms*, J. Funct. Anal. **194** (2002), 181–212.
[42] N. Randrianantoanina, *A weak type inequality for non-commutative martingales and applications*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **91** (2005), no. 2, 509–542.
[43] N. Randrianantoanina, *Conditioned square functions for noncommutative martingales*, Ann. Probab. **35** (2007), no. 3, 1039–1070.
[44] H. P. Rosenthal, *On the subspaces of L^p $(p \geq 2)$ spanned by sequences of independent random variables*, Israel J. Math. **8** (1970), 273–303.
[45] M. Takesaki, *Theory of operator algebras. I*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1979.
[46] Q. Xu, *Analytic functions with values in lattices and symmetric spaces of measurable operators*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **109** (1991), 541–563.

Department of Mathematics, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056, USA
E-mail address: `randrin@miamioh.edu`

School of Probability and Statistics, Central South University, Changsha 410075, China and Department of Mathematics, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056, USA
E-mail address: `wul5@miamioh.edu`